arXiv:1410.5041v3 [quant-ph] 17 Jun 2015

On the Lorentz invariance of the Square root Klein-Gordon (Salpeter)Equation

M. J. Kazemi [1*], M. H. Barati[2†], Jafar Khodagholizadeh [3‡]and Alireza Babazadeh[4§]

[1] *Department of Physics, Shahid Beheshti University, G. C., Evin,Tehran 19839, Iran.*

[2] *Department of Physics, kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran.*

[3]*School of physics, Institute for research in fundamental sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran*

[4]*Optics, Laser and Photonics Insttitute ,*

Amirkabir University of Technology, Valiasr Ave.,Tehran, Iran.

Abstract

We show that the Born's rule is incompatible with Lorentz symmetry of the Square Root Klein-Gordon equation (Salpeter equation). It has been demonstrated that the Born rule must be modified in relativistic regime if one wishes to keep the Salpeter equation as the correct equation for describing quantum behavior.

PACS numbers:

Keywords: Salpeter equation, Relativistic Quantum Mechanics, Quantum Measurement theory, Spinless Salpeter Equation.

* kazemi.j.m@gmail.com

† mohbarati14@gmail.com

‡ Lecturer in Farhangian University, Tehran,Iran. Email: gholizadeh@ipm.ir

§ arbabazadeh@yahoo.com

I. INTRODUCTION

The simplest relativistic generalization of the Schrodinger equation could be derived from direct substitution of $p \to i\hbar\nabla$ and $E \to i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ into the relativistic energy-momentum relation $E = \sqrt{c^2p^2 + m_0^2c^4}$. Such procedure leads to

$$ih\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = mc^2\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(\frac{i\hbar}{mc})^{2k}\begin{pmatrix}1/2\\k\end{pmatrix}\nabla^{2k}\psi \tag{1}$$

this equation is so called "Square Root Klein-Gordon Equation"(SRKG equation) or "Salpeter Equation". The integral-differential form of this equation can be used in order to circumvent the divergence of above expansion:

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(\mathbf{x},t)}{\partial t} = \int K(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^{'})\psi(\mathbf{x}^{'})d\mathbf{x}^{'} \tag{2}$$

where the integral kernel,K can be expressed as follows:

$$K(\mathbf{z}) = -\frac{mc^2}{2\pi^2}\frac{K_2(|\mathbf{z}|/l_c)}{|\mathbf{z}|/l_c} \tag{3}$$

Where $K_\nu(|\mathbf{z}|/l_c)$ is the modified Bessel function (Macdonald function) and l_c is the Compton wavelength. Historical background of the equation (1) dates back to the early years of the relativistic quantum mechanics. In 1927, Wayl proposed using square root operator, $\sqrt{-c^2\hbar^2\nabla^2 + m_0^2c^4}$ to formulate the relativistic quantum mechanics [1], however he didn't develop his idea to a comprehensive theory. On the other hand, other pioneers of quantum mechanics used different methods to formulate Relativistic Quantum Mechanics which led to the Dirac and the Klein- Gordon equations. Eventually, the square root Klein-Gordon equation often did not accepte in the growing formulation of Relativistic Quantum Mechanics. But in recent years, theoretical characteristics and integral representations of this equation have been the matter of interest [2–7]. Moreover, this equation recently was used to describe some phenomena and problems in relativistic regime such as: Relativistic Harmonic Oscillator [8–10], waves in Relativistic Quantum Plasma [11], Relativistic Bound state (quark-antiquark-gluon systems)[12–18], and Relativistic Bohmian Mechanics [19]. We particularly point out the consistency between the results of this equation with the experimental spectrum of the mesonic atoms [12]. Furthermore, since this equation is first order with respect to time, we can use the Born rule ($\rho_B = |\psi|^2$) to interpret the wave function and hence the problem of negative probability density of the Klein-Gordon equation would

not arise. In this regard, the current density and the Born probability density is obtained as follows:[3]

$$\rho_B = |\psi|^2 \tag{4}$$

$$J_B = -\frac{imc^2}{\hbar}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{(2k-3)!!}{(2k)!!}(\frac{\hbar}{mc})^{2k} \times \sum_{l=0}^{2k-1}(-1)^l\nabla^l\psi^\star\nabla^{2k-2l-1}\psi \tag{5}$$

In which, ρ_B is the Born probability density and $\mathbf{J}_B$ is the corresponding current density. In fact this probabilistic interpretation possibility of the wave function has been often a motivation for utilizing the square root Klein-Gordon equation.

On the other hand,the Lorentz invariance of this equation has often been under discussion. Because of its high derivatives, checking Lorentz invariance of this equation is so complicated and cannot be specified easily, . And also , because of the inequality of time and space derivatives, this equation has been mistakenly accepted as a frame dependent equation and incompatible with special relativity [16],[20–25]. It should be noted that for checking the Lorentz invariance of an equation need to be determined Lorentz transformation of all quantity in the equation; and one cannot give opinions about the Lorentz invariance of an equation only based on the Lorentz transformation of the differential operators. On the other hand the Lorentz transformation of every quantity must be determined by their physical definitions. Thus Lorentz transformation of complex quantities such as wave function must be determined based on their physical interpretation and their relations to the observable quantities. For this purpose by accepting the probabilistic interpretation of the wave function, the Lorentz transformation of the wave function must be determined by its relation to position probability density ρ . Explicitly, Lorentz transformation of the wave function should be considered in a way that probability density ,ρ and the probability current density, $\mathbf{J}$ are altogether transformed as one four-vector.Therefore, it should be noted that before the wave function is interpreted - which determines its Lorentz transformation - the square root Klein-Gordon is neither Lorentz invariant nor Lorentz non-invariant.

In fact the Lorentz invariance of the square root Klein-Gordon equation was already shown; considering the wave function as scalar (in the absence of interaction). But scalar wave function is inconsistent with Born interpretation because $\rho_B = |\psi|^2$ is the first component of the probability current four-vector and cannot be scalar. Now if we accept the Born

rule for the probabilistic interpretation of wave function, then the common proofs for the Lorentz invariance of the square root Klein-Gordon equation are incomplete because they are all under the condition of the wave function being scalar. The question that arises at this point is whether or not we could find any Lorentz transformation for the wave function that leads to: 1) Lorentz invariance of the square root Klein-Gordon equation; and 2) ρ_B and J_B are altogether transformed as one four-vector. In the next section we will show that there does not exist such transformation; and because the two above conditions cannot be simultaneously satisfied, the Born rule is completely inconsistent with the Lorentz symmetry of the square root Klein-Gordon equation.

II. PROVE OF INCOMPATIBILITY OF THE BORN RULE WITH LORENTZ SYMMETRY OF THE SQUARE ROOT KLEIN-GORDON EQUATION

In this section we will present a simple counterexample to show there is no transformation for the wave function that leads to the Lorentz invariance of all three equations (1),(4) and (5). In this regard we consider the wave function as a superposition of two plane waves in two inertial reference frames S and $S^{'}$ (in one dimension):

$$\psi(x,t) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} A_i e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(p_i x - E_i t)} \tag{6}$$

$$\psi^{'}(x^{'},t^{'}) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} A_i^{'} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(p_i^{'} x^{'} - E_i^{'} t^{'})} \tag{7}$$

Where $E_i = p_i^0 = \sqrt{p_i^2 c^2 + m_0^2 c^4}$, It should be noted that this choice for time evaluation of the wave functions ensure the establishment of square root Klein-Gordon equation in both frameworks. Applying equations (4) ,(5) for above wave functions leads to:

$$\rho_B = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} |A_i||A_j| \cos((p_i^{\mu} - p_j^{\mu})x_{\mu} + \delta_{ij}) \tag{8}$$

$$\rho_B^{'} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} |A_i^{'}||A_j^{'}| \cos((p_i^{\mu} - p_j^{\mu})x_{\mu} + \delta_{ij}^{'}) \tag{9}$$

$$J_B = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} |A_i||A_j| U_{ij} \cos((p_i^{\mu} - p_j^{\mu})x_{\mu} + \delta_{ij}) \tag{10}$$

$$J_B^{'} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} |A_i^{'}||A_j^{'}|U_{ij}^{'} \cos((p_i^{\mu} - p_j^{\mu})x_{\mu} + \delta_{ij}^{'}) \tag{11}$$

Where δ_{ij} is the phase difference between A_i and A_j and U_{ij} be defined as follows:

$$U_{ij} = \frac{p_i + p_j}{E_i + E_j} c^2$$

and prime quantities are similarly defined in $S^{'}$. Lorentz transformation of probability density ,$\rho^{'} = \gamma(\rho_B - \frac{v}{c^2} J_B)$ leads to following equations:

$$|A_1^{'}||A_2^{'}| = \alpha_{12}|A_1||A_2| \tag{12}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} (|A_i^{'}|^2 - \alpha_{ii}|A_i|^2) = 0 \tag{13}$$

where $\alpha_{ij} = \gamma(1 - (vU_{ij})/c^2)$. Also current Lorentz transformation,$J_B^{'} = \gamma(J_B - v\rho_B)$, leads to:

$$|A_1^{'}||A_2^{'}| = \beta_{ij}|A_1||A_2| \tag{14}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} (|A_i^{'}|^2 - \alpha_{ii}|A_i|^2)U_{ii}^{'} = 0 \tag{15}$$

Where $\beta_{12} = \gamma \frac{U_{12} - v}{U_{12}^{'}}$. It is easy to show that $\beta_{12} = \alpha_{12}$ and then the equations (12), (14) are equivalent.The equations (13) and (15) are linear equations for two variables $|A_1^{'}|^2$ and $|A_2^{'}|^2$ that their solutions are as follows:

$$|A_i^{'}|^2 = \alpha_{ii}|A_i|^2 \quad ; \quad i = 1, 2 \tag{16}$$

But the above solutions are inconsistent with equation (12), because the direct substitution of equations (16) into equation (12) leads to the following incorrect equality (see figure 1):

$$\frac{\alpha_{11}\alpha_{22}}{\alpha_{12}^2} = 1 \tag{17}$$

So the system of equations (12) and (13) are not consistent with equations (14) and (15). In the other word there is not transformation for the wave function that leads to correct transformation for Born probability density. Therefore the Born interpretation is incompatible with the Lorentz symmetry of Salpeter equation.



FIG. 1: The diagram $\frac{\alpha_{11}\alpha_{22}}{\alpha_{12}^2}$ is plotted versus u_1 and u_2 (which u_1 and u_2 are the corresponding speeds of the momentums p_1 and p_2 respectively . It is clear that ($\frac{\alpha_{11}\alpha_{22}}{\alpha_{12}^2}$) is not equal to unity. So the Born rule is inconsistent with the Lorentz symmetry of the Salpeter equation. It should be noted that if $\frac{|u_1-u_2|}{c} \ll 1$ then $\frac{\alpha_{11}\alpha_{22}}{\alpha_{12}^2} \approx 1$, even if the speeds u_1 and u_2 are comparable to the speed of ligh.

III. THE CORRECTION OF THE BORN RULE

In the previous section we show that the Born rule is incompatible with the Lorentz symmetry of Salpeter equation, so to make a consistent formalism for relativistic quantum mechanics, the Born rule or Salpeter equation (or both of them) should be modified. In fact by using the Dirac equation, the Born rule is preserved and the Salpeter equation is modified. Another possibility is to keep the Salpeter equation and modify the Born rule. In this regard as an initial effort, the following general form for the relativistic correction for the Born rule is recommended (in one diminution):

$$\rho = |\hat{A}\psi|^2 + |\hat{B}\psi|^2 \tag{18}$$

In which the pseudo-differential operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ are define as follows:

$$\hat{A} = \sqrt{\hat{E}+1} \tag{19}$$

$$\hat{B} = \frac{\hat{p}}{\sqrt{\hat{E}+1}} \tag{20}$$

For understanding the origin of the above definitions, consider the general positive energy solution of Dirac equation (in one dimension:

$$\Psi(x,t) = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \varphi(p) u(p) e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(px - E(p)t)} dp \tag{21}$$

where $\Psi(x,t)$ represents the two-component Dirac spinor and $\varphi(p)$ is wave function in momentum space and $u(p)$ is positive energy plane wave solution of Dirac equation:

$$u(p) = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{E+1} \\ \frac{p}{\sqrt{E+1}} \end{bmatrix} \tag{22}$$

If we define ψ as:

$$\psi(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \varphi(p) e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(px - E(p)t)} dp \tag{23}$$

Then the Dirac spinor,Ψ, could be rewritten in terms of ψas follow:

$$\Psi(x,t) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}\psi \\ \hat{B}\psi \end{bmatrix} \tag{24}$$

Also the Dirac probability density, ρ_D, and current density, $\mathbf{J}_D$,could be rewritten in terms of ψ as follow:

$$\rho_D = (\hat{A}\psi)(\hat{A}\psi)^\star + (\hat{B}\psi)(\hat{B}\psi)^\star \tag{25}$$

$$J_D = (\hat{A}\psi)^\star(\hat{B}\psi) + (A\psi)(\hat{B}\psi)^\star \tag{26}$$

From eq.(23) it is clear that $\psi(x,t)$ satisfies the Salpeter equation, Therefore the Salpeter equation along with the interpretation of the wave function based on the eq. (18) , leads to a formalism equivalent with the positive energy solutions of the Dirac equation. of course we know that ρ_D and $\mathbf{J}_D$ make altogether a four-vector; so the eq. (25) and eq.(26) can be used as an acceptable relativistic interpretation of the Salpeter equation. It shows the possibility of a consistent probabilistic interpretation of the Salpeter equation. Our purpose in this paper is only to show such possibilities; although other possibilities for a correct relativistic interpretation of the wave function might exist. However to achieve a consistent

relativistic quantum mechanics based on the Salpeter, the probability density of position must be necessarily deviated from the Born rule.

The question that arises at this stage is: The deviation from the Born rule in the relativistic level is just only for the probability distribution of position or the probability distribution of the other quantities deviated from the Born rule? To answer this question, we note that there are several methods for extracting the Born rule for other quantities from this rule is in the case of position. As a specific example,$|\varphi|^2$as the momentum probability density have been obtained by analyzing the time of flight measurement with the assumption of the Born rule in position measurement[26]. In general, the establishment of Born rule on other observable quantities can be derived according to the causal theory of measurement with the assumption Born rule in position measurement [26, 27]. In all such demonstration, the measurement of other quantities related to measurement of position and thus the establishment of the Born rule for the probability density of position has a key role in the derivation of this rule for other observable. Consequently, deviation of position probability density from the Born rule can deviate probability density of other quantities from the Born rule.

IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We show that the Square Root Klein-Gordon equation with a reformation of the Born rule will be Lorentz invariant.Our calculations in this paper were performed in the absence of external field, but the most doubts about the Lorentz invariance of Salpeter equation are in the presence of external fields [28–31].For example in 1963,J.Sucher showed that the Salpeter equations not Lorentz invariance in the presence of interactions by entering the interaction with minimal coupling $\partial_\mu \longrightarrow \partial_\mu - ieA_\mu$. Sucher assumed that the wave function is a scalar[29]. But the default scalar wave function is not required and the transformation properties of the wave function may be more complex. In fact Lorentz transformation of the wave function must be determined according to its physical interpretation and we have shown that with a proper interpretation of the wave function the Salpeter(in the absence of the external field) will be Lorentz invariant off course in this case, wave function is not scalar. So in the presence of interaction, it is possible the wave function may not be scalar. Therefore the Sucher proof should not be considered as a final proof of the non-Lorentz invariance of the square root Klein- Gordon equation and may be, this equation is Lorentz invariant with

the proper interpretation of the wave function even in the presence of interaction. We leave the checking of this possibility as a open problem.

---

[1] H. Weyl: Zeit. f. Physik 46 (1927) pp. 38-44

[2] J.J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg, Communications in Pure and applied Mathematics, 18,293295.(1965a). No.5, 199.

[3] Kh. Namsrai, International Journal of Theoretical Physics, Vol.37,No.5, 199.

[4] K. Kowalski and J. Rembielinski, PHYSICAL REVIEW A 84, 012108 (2011)

[5] T. L. Gill, W. W. Zachary and M. Alfred, J. Phys. A, Vol. 38, Nu. 31

[6] T. L. Gill and W. W. Zachary, J. Phys. A, Vol. 38, 2479- 2496, (2005).

[7] F. Brau, J. Math. Phys. 39, 2254 (1998).

[8] Zhi-Feng Li, Jin-Jin Liu, W. Lucha , Wen-Gan Ma and F. F. Schberl, J. Math. Phys. 46, 103514

[9] R. L. Hall, W. Lucha and F. F. Schoberl, J. Phys. A 34 (2001), 50595064.

[10] K. Kowalski, J. Rembielinski,Phys.Rev.A81:012118,2010

[11] F. HAAS, Journal of Plasma Physics / Volume 79 / Spe- cial Issue 04 / August 2013, pp 371-376

[12] J. L. Friar and E. L. Tomusiak, Phys. Rev. C 29, 1537 Published 1 April 1984

[13] W. Lucha ,Franz F Schberl, Physics Letters B, Volume 387, Issue 3, 24 October 1996

[14] I. W. Herbst, Math.Phys. 53 (1977), 285294; 55 (1977), 316 (addendum).

[15] R. L. Hall, W. Lucha and F. F. Schoberl, J. Math. Phys. 42 (2001)

[16] C. Semay, Physics Letters A, Volume 376, Issue 33, 2 July 2012

[17] F. Brau, J.Nonlin.Math.Phys. 12 (2005)

[18] F. Brau, J. Math. Phys. 46, 032305 (2005);

[19] J. Khodagholizadeh,M. J. Kazemi, A. Babazadeh, arXiv:1405.3822

[20] A. Wachter : Relativistic Quantum Mechanics, springer, (2011)

[21] J.D. Bjorken, S. D. Drell, Relativistic quantum mechan- ics, McGraw-Hill, New York (1964)

[22] P. Strange, Relativistic Quantum Mechanics with appli- cations in condensed matter and atomic physics, Cam- bridge University Press (1998)

[23] B. Friman, Relativistic quantum mechanics, Lectures at the HADES summer school, Ober-

reifenberg (2002)

[24] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 155,(1936)

[25] A. Messiah, Quantum Mechanics, Volume 2, John Wiley and Sons, INC. New York

[26] P. R. Holland, The Quantum theory of motion, Cam- bridge university press,(1993)

[27] D. Durr, S. Goldstein, N. Zangh, Quantum Equilibrium and the Role of Operators as Observables in Quantum Theory, arXiv:quant-ph/0308038

[28] P. A.M. Dirac, The Principles of Quantum Mechanics, 4nd Edition, Oxford University press

[29] J. Sucher, Relativistic Invariance and the Square-Root Klein-Gordon Equation, J. Math. Phys. 4, 17(1963).

[30] J. R. Smith, On the inconsistency of minimal coupling in the presence of the square root Klein-Gordon operator - UCDPHY-IIRPA-93-41(Dec 1993)

[31] J. R. Smith, Second Quantization of the Square-Root Klein-Gordon Operator, 1994